

11/05/2005 17:03:00



"[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]@strategicawareness.com> on 11/05/2005 17:04:25

To: [REDACTED] Group Office/Risley/BNFL@BNFL  
cc:  
Fax to:  
Subject: After Dinner Speech

\*\*\*\*\* Message inserted by MIMESweeper \*\*\*\*\*

This email, received by bnfl.com has been virus scanned by MIMESweeper using DrSolomons TVD. Please treat all files received via the internet with extreme caution.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hi [REDACTED]

We thought the speech was great - great humour and key messages coming across well.

We feel that the content is more understated than is necessary wrt the benefits...and that while the negative language out there wrt nuclear should be highlighted - the opportunity should be taken to really re-inforce the positive language we want to instill...

Attached are our recommended amends -its probably best if we go through them on the phone tomorrow if that suits you.

I'll forward the Engagement Research Amends shortly.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Strategic Awareness Ltd.,  
2nd Floor,  
81 Whitfield St.,  
London W1T 4HG

Ph: 020 74627585

 - C.htm

 - After Dinner Speech.doc

11/05/2005 17:03:00

# DRAFT

## After dinner speech

Nuclear Energy is a controversial subject. It's one of those phrases that has attracted strong emotions in many people. Not at all worrying for me, since I have I worked in the industry for nearly 30 years. I guess people's reaction to the words "nuclear" have gone back to links with the atomic bomb and their negative associations with Chernobyl and most recently scare stories about nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear is something that many people have become afraid of, for them nuclear is a bad word.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: Delete. WMD more associated with chemical?

Comment: insert

Comment: insert

Nuclear Power. Power is a bad word too, it conjures up negative thoughts in your minds, through associations such as 'power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely'.

Comment: insert

Comment: insert

Comment: delete

Alternative energy sources have much better names, renewable energy - a fantastic phrase – renewable sounds positive and energy is good, we all like having energy. Clean Coal sounds quite good, I think the best the phrase of all is Wind Farm, what a lovely notion: the idea of farming the wind. It's a beautiful concept, but of course even this is now starting to attract negative connotations.

So for many nuclear loses before it starts. So can we evolve the image of nuclear energy?

Comment: Delete Power

Comment: insert

Comment: insert

Well, you might imagine that we could rebrand it, find a new name, can you imagine how we'd be pilloried if we tried to rebrand it. I remember in the early

DRAFT

so new generation build projects around the world. Over 20% of the UK's electricity is provided by nuclear and nearly 40% in Scotland.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: DELETE

Nuclear has huge environmental benefits – fact! is very good environmentally.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: DELETE

The carbon saved in OECD's nations by using nuclear energy instead of fossil fuels in any one year is around 1,200 million tonnes, that's more carbon than

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

will be saved in the OECD under the Kyoto protocol. Closer to home in the UK alone, the carbon emissions avoided by nuclear are equivalent to taking around ten million cars off the road and x planes out of the air – it makes a very effective weapon in the war on global warming fantastic contribution to avoiding global warming.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: DELETE

Nuclear is a reliable energy source – fact! Another key contribution of nuclear

Comment: INSERT

is that it contributes to the reliability of our energy supplies. It provides reliable baseload electricity. Clearly, a lot of renewable energies do not,

Comment: DELETE

Renewables are not - they tend to be dependent upon the weather; indeed on average they only produce on full power for 25% of the time.

Comment: INSERT

But my biggest concern in relation to reliability of energy supplies is the fact

that despite this our nuclear power stations are being closed. By 2023 we

Comment: DELETE

Comment: INSERT

will be reduced to only one nuclear power station in the UK. It seems

Comment: INSERT

inevitable that the nuclear baseload capacity is going to be replaced by additional gas capacity. The vast majority of that gas will be imported for the first time in a long time. We were a net importer of gas in 2004 and by 2020, 80% of our gas will be imported. Right now it's sourced from places such as

Comment: INSERT

COMMENT: INSERT

**D R A F T**

it Sometimes I think that we need to remind Government, to paraphrase Bill Clinton

Comment: DELETE

Well what about the big challenges for nuclear? There are two that everybody cites. The first is the issue of nuclear waste. The New Generation of designs produce less waste – indeed if we replaced all our existing reactors with the new generation state of the art reactors they would only add about 10% to the legacy of waste.

Comment: INSERT

Generally, nuclear waste is produced in very small quantities. If we compare the wastes that each one of us produces: each one of us individually produces around 500 tonnes of domestic waste throughout our lives. Each one of us produces around 500 tonnes of carbon emissions throughout our lives. And in terms of nuclear waste, if all the electricity we use throughout our lives were produced by nuclear then the total waste produced would only be about 8 litres, that wouldn't even fill a small waste paper bin.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Waste management is an issue. Everybody says that you haven't anywhere to put this waste – well that's not true, nearly all of that waste, about 80% of nuclear waste is low level waste for which there is already a long term disposal facility at Drigg in Cumbria. For the remaining 20% currently has no long term disposal route – although Government scientists are working on a solutions to store that waste.

Comment: INSERT

Comment: DELETE

Comment: insert

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Finland and Sweden are making better progress than us. There is wide recognition of the benefits that nuclear delivers and they are in the process of

Comment: INSERT

# DRAFT

A great benefit of nuclear is that nuclear costs are very insensitive to raw material costs. The fuel price only amounts to about 10% of the total cost.

Comment: INSERT

Nuclear is of course capital intensive: the new generation of reactor would cost at least a £billion each. Nuclear must be seen as a good long term investment; nuclear is a good steady reliable earner over the 60 year life of a new reactor. However, despite the cost of nuclear electricity being competitive, the large capital cost is a major hurdle to risk averse investors.

Comment: INSERT

Financing is the issue : not cost. To attract investment we need to look at two things. Firstly, nuclear must be seen to be delivering to time and cost: past

Comment: INSERT

experiences (particularly in the UK) have not been good but : but other countries like South Korea and China can do it and we have the potential to do it. too reactors are now being delivered on time and on budget regularly in

Comment: INSERT

the Far East – confidence should grow. Secondly, the market must provide an environment where long term (carbon free) investment can flourish. This means Govt must enable long term contracts to be put in place to provide confidence on future revenues: a level playing field with other low carbon technologies would be more than enough to encourage nuclear investment.

Comment: DELETE

Comment: INSERT

Comment: INSERT

Comment: DELETE

There should be no need for smoke and mirrors on nuclear economics. Unlike another advert I recall seeing early this year, it was a splash headline for Valentine's day "Bargain Breaks - Visit Paris for three days for £99". In the small print at the bottom it said "excludes 11-18 February". And I certainly don't want to see the headline "Red tape holds up Nuclear Power Station"

Comment: INSERT

So overall, on balance, I believe nuclear power should be seen as making a positive contribution to our energy mix. I'd love to see new nuclear build and don't want to see the headline 'Red Tape holds up Nuclear Power Station'.

Comment: DELETE - MOVE TO END

Many countries are becoming pro nuclear again: even the US...George Bush is very positive...Laura Bush mentioned the N word the other day at a White House Correspondents' Association dinner. The president traditionally delivers the punchlines, but this year, Laura Bush "interrupted" her husband to